

- 5 -

Remarks/Argument

The Applicant has amended claims 1 through 4 to correct some minor errors. No new matter has been added. The amended claims are no longer identical to those of Application No. 10/415,153.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 to 4 of the present application. In particular, the Applicant submits that the steps "calculating the time required to play all of the currently queued animations" and "if the time required to play all of the currently queued animations is greater than the minimum deadline of the server messages in the queue, accelerating the animation" are not described in Rogers.

With respect to the step "calculating the time required to play all of the currently queued animations", according to Rogers, col. 7, lines 26-30, the drawing "calculations" for the second frame of animation are stored in a buffer. These "calculations" in Rogers are not the time required to play the animation, but are the input necessary for determining the next animation (see col. 7, lines 19-21). Thus when Roger refers to calculations, they are not a reference to the time required to play an animation, but instead are the input from which the drawing operations and the next frame resulting from those operations will be determined (col. 7, lines 26-29). Given these very different "calculations" as used in the present application and in Rogers, the Applicant submits that Rogers does not include the step "calculating the time required to play all of the currently queued animations".

With respect to the step "if the time required to play all of the currently queued animations is greater than the minimum deadline of the server messages in the queue, accelerating the animation", as discussed above, Rogers does not disclose the calculation of the time required to play the currently queued animations. Also, Rogers does not include a queue of server messages (as Rogers describes a process that takes place within a single computer) so that the calculations of Rogers (which, as described above, relate to input necessary for determining the next animation) cannot be compared to a minimum deadline of server messages. As Rogers

DM\_VAN/260331-00004/6377272.1

- 6 -


does not mention or suggest the use of server messages at all, Rogers cannot describe such a step.

Finally, the Applicant submits that the Rogers does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. The present application deals with processing animation in a networked computer environment whereas Rogers deals with processing animation within a single computer. While both deal with animation, Rogers does not deal with or consider messages sent from one computer to another, and the role such messages play in the animation processing. The Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that Rogers does not teach or suggest a combination with the Applicant Admitted Prior Art, and therefore should not be the basis of a 35 USC 103 objection.

Given the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Armand Benitah (Reg. No. 56026)  
c/o Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP  
Suite 2100, 1075 West Georgia Street  
Vancouver, British Columbia V6E 3G2  
Tel: 604-631-4743  
Fax: 604-632-4743

DM\_VAN/260331-00004/6377272.1